

Remarks

Claims 1-17 were presented in the original application. Claims 1-8 and claim 11 have been canceled. Claim 9 is allowable and has been amended to comply with formal requirement of the Office Action. Claims 16-17 are allowed. Claim 10 has been amended. Reconsideration of claims 10, and 12-15 is requested. All pending claims are believed in condition for allowance.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102:

Claims 1-4 and 7 were rejected. Claims 1-4 and 7 are canceled without prejudice.

Claims 1 and 8 are rejected. Claims 1 and 8 are canceled without prejudice.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103:

Claims 1,4, 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams (USPN 4209098) in view of Bisping et al. (USPN 4119285). Claims 1,4 and 8 are canceled. Claim 10 has been amended to make clear that the “substantially cylindrical” clip member is “in contact with at least the top portion and both sides of a grill rod”. Neither Bisping nor its combination with Adams teaches or suggests such feature (such feature is clearly supported by the drawings and specification in sentence 1 of paragraph 14). The rejection is thus traversed.

The Applicant presented the argument in the previous response that Bisping’s “clip pipe holder” would not be adapted to clean the top section of a grill rod, and thus it was not a “substantially cylindrical” clip member and the combined references could not function as a grill cleaner. In response to the Applicant’s argument, the recent Office Action disagrees on the interpretation of “substantially cylindrical” clip member, but suggests that the Applicant would need to explicitly claim the feature of clip member in contact with both sides and the top portion of a grill rod. The Applicant could not present such amendment in earlier responses because the Applicant implied in the

argument that “substantially cylindrical” clip member would be in contact with the top section and both sides. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests that such amendment be entered, and the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 10, 12 and 15 were rejected as being unpatentable over Losenno in view of Kendrena. Claims 10 has been amended to make clear that “substantially cylindrical” clip members are “in contact with the top portion and both sides of a grill rod”. Neither Losenno nor its combination with Kendrena teaches or suggests such feature. Claims 12 and 15 include all the limitations of claim 10. The rejections to claims 10, 12 and 15 are thus traversed.

Claims 5-6 were rejected. Claims 5-6 are canceled.

Claim 13 and 14 were rejected as being unpatentable over Losenno in view of Kendrena or Adams in view of Bisping. Claims 13 and 14 depend from claim 10. Claim 10 has been amended. The combination of Losenno with Kendrena, and Adams with Bisping failed to teach or suggest the features in claim 10 as discussed earlier. The rejections to claims 13 and 14 are thus traversed.

In summary, the Applicant respectfully requests that all the remaining claims be passed to issue. While an attempt has been made to address all outstanding issues, to any extent that one or more issues remain, the undersigned respectfully requests a telephone conference to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

April 27, 2006



Shulong Li
Patent Agent
Registration # 51,944
Telephone: (864) 576-9305